

REDACTED
REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points): 0.0

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole Public Schools

Applicant ID: EE0413020

Reviewer:

Exemption to Personal Privacy

REDACTED

PURPOSE - This form is used to evaluate proposals based on criteria and associated points delineated in the EE Regional Model Grant Solicitation Notice for 2012. In addition, reviewers must provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals for each criterion, and overall comments about the proposal at the end of the form. Clear, substantive and constructive comments document for the record scores given to proposals, and also help in the debriefing of applicants who request a follow-up conversation after receiving their scores.

PRIORITIES: For informational purposes, identify which priorities the proposal addresses.

Educational Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box (es) for the educational priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Community Projects: Addressing environmental stewardship in a local formal or informal educational context in rural, suburban and urban settings, and using outdoor, place-based, experiential, service learning and /or community-focused stewardship activities as the primary teaching tool(s). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Human Health and the Environment: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, in the outdoors and in classrooms, about human health threats from environmental pollution and how to minimize human exposure to preserve good health. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Career Development: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, about environmental issues, solutions and stewardship for the purpose of encouraging interest in careers in environmental fields.. |

Environmental Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box(es) for the environmental priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Protecting Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Assuring Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cleaning Up Our Communities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Protecting America's Waters |

REDACTED

- (3) **Project Evaluation:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant explains how the project's success will be tracked and measured and the quality of the evaluation plan (see Section IV(C)(3)(c)):

0.0 pts 0-10

Substantively, clearly, and completely explains how success in meeting project goals and objectives will be achieved, tracked and measured. The evaluation plan should include indications of how progress in achieving the proposed project outputs and outcomes will be tracked and measured, including how well the project supports EPA's Strategic Plan and the improvement of the environment over time.

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 10 points)

Comments (Required):

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

- (4) **Budget:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(4)):

0.0 pts 0-9

(i) Does the budget information clearly and accurately show how all funds, both EPA and non-federal funds, will be used.

0.0 pts 0-5

(ii) Is the funding request reasonable given the activities proposed and does the project provide a good return on the investment.

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 14 points)

Comments (Required):

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

- (5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how clearly and completely and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(5)):

0.0 pts 0-6

(i) **Timeline:** Does the timeline link the activities to a clear project schedule, and clearly indicate a realistic timeline of when each action, event, milestone, and evaluation will occur.

0.0 pts 0-6

(ii) **Logic Model:** Does the applicant, through a Logic Model, clarify in a graphic display the outputs and outcomes developed through the project in accordance with the instructions and information in Appendix C.

0.0 pts 0-6

(iii) **Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Do the letters of commitment from partners demonstrate how the applicant will engage with their partner(s) to **effectively develop and implement the project as a model that could be replicated**, and could advance and strengthen the field of EE.

REDACTED

No points should be awarded if no letters of commitment are included, or if letters only indicate endorsement or recommendation of the project. The number of points awarded should reflect the extent of the partnership(s) as described in the letters, and the ability of said partnership(s) to fulfill the project goals.

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 18 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - See Section V of the Solicitation Notice for a full explanation of the criteria and scoring.

- (1) **Project Summary:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the project summary clearly and completely addresses the content and format described in Section IV(C)(3)(a). Summary should include:
- Description of applicant organization and partnerships.
 - Summary of project that indicates that the current project has not been previously funded; how it is a **model, replicable program**; and includes project goals and objectives.
 - Description of how project is to be implemented.
 - Description of the target audience.
 - Lists the expenses and costs associated with the project that EPA will finance.

0.0 pts 0-3

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 3 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

- (2) **Project Description:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and the extent to which the applicant addresses the format and content described in Section IV(C)(3)(b):

- 0.0 pts 0-10 (i) **What:** Substantively, clearly and completely explains what the project will entail, including the educational and environmental priorities addressed, the goals the project hopes to achieve, how it will serve as a **replicable model** for advancing and strengthening the field of environmental education and how the project encourages behavior change associated with stewardship.
- 0.0 pts 0-10 (ii) **Why:** Substantively, clearly and completely explain the **need for the project as a model**, including why the particular goals, priorities and audience(s) have been chosen.
- 0.0 pts 0-10 (iii) **How:** Substantively, clearly and completely explain how the project will accomplish the stated goals and objectives, including how well the project will encourage behavioral change and increased environmental stewardship, how its methods or programs will **serve as a model capable of being replicated in a variety of settings**, and how it will advance and strengthen the field of environmental education.
- 0.0 pts 0-10 (iv) **Who:** Proposals will be evaluated based on how well the project:
- Identifies the target audience, numbers reached, why they were chosen, and clearly explains the recruitment plan, including incentives to be used such as teacher stipends or continuing education credits and if/how the applicant's partner(s) will help with recruitment. (5 points)
 - Reaches a diverse audience, including but not limited to minority, low income and tribal communities, and demonstrates how the project will help address environmental issues that are more likely to adversely affect the audience (s) targeted. (5 points)

REDACTED

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 40 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

(6) Programmatic Capability and Past Performance: Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Sections IV(C)(5)(c) and V(A)(5)):

- 0.0 pts 0-2 (i) Does the applicant provide evidence of past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- 0.0 pts 0-2 (ii) Does the applicant demonstrate a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement, including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- 0.0 pts 0-5 (iii) Does the applicant provide evidence of organizational experience and a plan for the timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project.
- 0.0 pts 0-6 (iv) Does the applicant provide evidence of staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources (and/or the ability to obtain them) to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

NOTE: EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant.

0.0 Subtotal (0 to 15 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Worksheet:

<u>Possible points</u>	<u>Score</u>		
0-3	0.0	(1) Project Summary	Exemption 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Predecisional/Deliberative
0-40	0.0	(2) Project Description	<input type="checkbox"/> Attorney work product
0-10	0.0	(3) Project Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Attorney-client privilege
0-14	0.0	(4) Budget	
0-18	0.0	(5) Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment	
0-15	0.0	(6) Programmatic Capability and Past Performance	
	0.0	TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)	

REDACTED

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole County Public Schools

Applicant ID: EE 0413020

Reviewer: REDACTED

Exemption 6 Personal Privacy

Overall strengths of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Overall weaknesses of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points):

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole County Public Schools
Applicant ID: EE0413020
Reviewer: REDACTED

Exemption 6 Personal Privacy

PURPOSE - This form is used to evaluate proposals based on criteria and associated points delineated in the EE Regional Model Grant Solicitation Notice for 2012. In addition, reviewers must provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals for each criterion, and overall comments about the proposal at the end of the form. Clear, substantive and constructive comments document for the record scores given to proposals, and also help in the debriefing of applicants who request a follow-up conversation after receiving their scores.

PRIORITIES: For informational purposes, identify which priorities the proposal addresses.

Educational Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box (es) for the educational priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- X **Community Projects:** Addressing environmental stewardship in a local formal or informal educational context in rural, suburban and urban settings, and using outdoor, place-based, experiential, service learning and /or community-focused stewardship activities as the primary teaching tool(s).
Human Health and the Environment: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, in the outdoors and in classrooms, about human health threats from environmental pollution and how to minimize human exposure to preserve good health.
Career Development: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, about environmental issues, solutions and stewardship for the purpose of encouraging interest in careers in environmental fields..

Environmental Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box(es) for the environmental priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- Protecting Air Quality**
Assuring Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution
Cleaning Up Our Communities
x **Protecting America's Waters**

REDACTED

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - See Section V of the Solicitation Notice for a full explanation of the criteria and scoring.

- (1) **Project Summary:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the project summary clearly and completely addresses the content and format described in Section IV(C)(3)(a). Summary should include:

- Description of applicant organization and partnerships.
- Summary of project that indicates that the current project has not been previously funded; how it is a **model, replicable program**; and includes project goals and objectives.
- Description of how project is to be implemented.
- Description of the target audience.
- Lists the expenses and costs associated with the project that EPA will finance.

0.0 pts 0-3

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (2) **Project Description:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and the extent to which the applicant addresses the format and content described in Section IV(C)(3)(b):

- | | |
|------|--|
| 0-10 | (i) What: Substantively, clearly and completely explains what the project will entail, including the educational and environmental priorities addressed, the goals the project hopes to achieve, how it will serve as a replicable model for advancing and strengthening the field of environmental education and how the project encourages behavior change associated with stewardship. |
| 0-10 | (ii) Why: Substantively, clearly and completely explain the need for the project as a model , including why the particular goals, priorities and audience(s) have been chosen. |
| 0-10 | (iii) How: Substantively, clearly and completely explain how the project will accomplish the stated goals and objectives, including how well the project will encourage behavioral change and increased environmental stewardship, how its methods or programs will serve as a model capable of being replicated in a variety of settings , and how it will advance and strengthen the field of environmental education. |
| 0-10 | (iv) Who: Proposals will be evaluated based on how well the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identifies the target audience, numbers reached, why they were chosen, and clearly explains the recruitment plan, including incentives to be used such as teacher stipends or continuing education credits and if/how the applicant's partner(s) will help with recruitment. (5 points)• Reaches a diverse audience, including but not limited to minority, low income and tribal communities, and demonstrates how the project will help address environmental issues that are more likely to adversely affect the audience (s) targeted. (5 points) |

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (3) **Project Evaluation:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant explains how the project's success will be tracked and measured and the quality of the evaluation plan (see Section IV(C)(3)(c)):

0-10 Substantively, clearly, and completely explains how success in meeting project goals and objectives will be achieved, tracked and measured. The evaluation plan should include indications of how progress in achieving the proposed project outputs and outcomes will be tracked and measured, including how well the project supports EPA's Strategic Plan and the improvement of the environment over time.

Subtotal (0 to 10 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (4) **Budget:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Section IV(C) (4)):

pts 0-9 (i) Does the budget information clearly and accurately show how all funds, both EPA and non-federal funds, will be used.
pts 0-5 (ii) Is the funding request reasonable given the activities proposed and does the project provide a good return on the investment.

Subtotal (0 to 14 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how clearly and completely and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(5)):

pts 0-6 (i) **Timeline:** Does the timeline link the activities to a clear project schedule, and clearly indicate a realistic timeline of when each action, event, milestone, and evaluation will occur.
pts 0-6 (ii) **Logic Model:** Does the applicant, through a Logic Model, clarify in a graphic display the outputs and outcomes developed through the project in accordance with the instructions and information in Appendix C.
pts 0-6 (iii) **Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Do the letters of commitment from partners demonstrate how the applicant will engage with their partner(s) to effectively develop and implement the project as a model that could be replicated, and could advance and strengthen the field of EE.

No points should be awarded if no letters of commitment are included, or if letters only indicate endorsement or recommendation of the project. The number of points awarded should reflect the extent of the partnership(s) as described in the letters, and the ability of said partnership(s) to fulfill the project goals.

Subtotal (0 to 18 points)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Environmental Education Regional Model Grants Review

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

REDACTED

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Sections IV(C)(5)(c) and V(A)(5)):

- pts 0-2 (i) Does the applicant provide evidence of past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- pts 0-2 (ii) Does the applicant demonstrate a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement, including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- pts 0-5 (iii) Does the applicant provide evidence of organizational experience and a plan for the timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project.
- pts 0-6 (iv) Does the applicant provide evidence of staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources (and/or the ability to obtain them) to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

NOTE: EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant.

Subtotal (0 to 15 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Worksheet:

Possible points	Score
0-3	(1) Project Summary
0-40	(2) Project Description
0-10	(3) Project Evaluation
0-14	(4) Budget
0-18	(5) Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment
0-15	(6) Programmatic Capability and Past Performance
TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)	

Exemption 5

Predecisional/Deliberative
Attorney work product
Attorney-client privilege

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Environmental Education Regional Model Grants Review

REDACTED

EVALUATION

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole County Public Schools

Applicant ID: EE0413020

Reviewer: REDACTED

Exemption 6 Personal Privacy

Overall strengths of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Overall weaknesses of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

EVALUATION

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points):

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole County Public Schools

Applicant ID: EE0413020

Reviewer:

REDACTED

Exemption 6 Personal Privacy

PURPOSE - This form is used to evaluate proposals based on criteria and associated points delineated in the EE Regional Model Grant Solicitation Notice for 2012. In addition, reviewers must provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals for each criterion, and overall comments about the proposal at the end of the form. Clear, substantive and constructive comments document for the record scores given to proposals, and also help in the debriefing of applicants who request a follow-up conversation after receiving their scores.

PRIORITIES: For informational purposes, identify which priorities the proposal addresses.

Educational Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box (es) for the educational priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Community Projects: Addressing environmental stewardship in a local formal or informal educational context in rural, suburban and urban settings, and using outdoor, place-based, experiential, service learning and /or community-focused stewardship activities as the primary teaching tool(s). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Human Health and the Environment: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, in the outdoors and in classrooms, about human health threats from environmental pollution and how to minimize human exposure to preserve good health. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Career Development: Educating students of any age group, from the very young through the elderly, and training their educators or community leaders on how to teach, in formal and non-formal settings, about environmental issues, solutions and stewardship for the purpose of encouraging interest in careers in environmental fields.. |

Environmental Priority: Grant applications must provide information about how the applicant will address at least one of the priorities listed below. Check the appropriate box(es) for the environmental priority(s) named by the applicant (and/or those addressed by the applicant, as determined by the reviewer) (see Section I(C)).

Reviewer Applicant

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Protecting Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Assuring Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cleaning Up Our Communities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Protecting America's Waters |

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - See Section V of the Solicitation Notice for a full explanation of the criteria and scoring.

- (1) **Project Summary:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the project summary clearly and completely addresses the content and format described in Section IV(C)(3)(a). Summary should include:
- Description of applicant organization and partnerships.
 - Summary of project that indicates that the current project has not been previously funded; how it is a **model, replicable program**; and includes project goals and objectives.
 - Description of how project is to be implemented.
 - Description of the target audience.
 - Lists the expenses and costs associated with the project that EPA will finance.

pts 0-3

Subtotal (0 to 3 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (2) **Project Description:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and the extent to which the applicant addresses the format and content described in Section IV(C)(3)(b):

pts 0-10 (i) **What:** Substantively, clearly and completely explains what the project will entail, including the educational and environmental priorities addressed, the goals the project hopes to achieve, how it will serve as a **replicable model** for advancing and strengthening the field of environmental education and how the project encourages behavior change associated with stewardship.

pts 0-10 (ii) **Why:** Substantively, clearly and completely explain the **need for the project as a model**, including why the particular goals, priorities and audience(s) have been chosen.

pts 0-10 (iii) **How:** Substantively, clearly and completely explain how the project will accomplish the stated goals and objectives, including how well the project will encourage behavioral change and increased environmental stewardship, how its methods or programs will **serve as a model capable of being replicated in a variety of settings**, and how it will advance and strengthen the field of environmental education.

pts 0-10 (iv) **Who:** Proposals will be evaluated based on how well the project:

- Identifies the target audience, numbers reached, why they were chosen, and clearly explains the recruitment plan, including incentives to be used such as teacher stipends or continuing education credits and if/how the applicant's partner(s) will help with recruitment. (5 points)
- Reaches a diverse audience, including but not limited to minority, low income and tribal communities, and demonstrates how the project will help address environmental issues that are more likely to adversely affect the audience (s) targeted. (5 points)

Subtotal (0 to 40 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5 ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

- (3) **Project Evaluation:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent to which the applicant explains how the project's success will be tracked and measured and the quality of the evaluation plan (see Section IV(C)(3)(c)):

pts 0-10

Substantively, clearly, and completely explains how success in meeting project goals and objectives will be achieved, tracked and measured. The evaluation plan should include indications of how progress in achieving the proposed project outputs and outcomes will be tracked and measured, including how well the project supports EPA's Strategic Plan and the improvement of the environment over time.

Subtotal (0 to 10 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (4) **Budget:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(4)):

pts 0-9

(i) Does the budget information clearly and accurately show how all funds, both EPA and non-federal funds, will be used.

pts 0-5

(ii) Is the funding request reasonable given the activities proposed and does the project provide a good return on the investment.

Subtotal (0 to 14 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

- (5) **Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how clearly and completely and to what extent (see Section IV(C)(5)):

pts 0-6

(i) **Timeline:** Does the timeline link the activities to a clear project schedule, and clearly indicate a realistic timeline of when each action, event, milestone, and evaluation will occur.

pts 0-6

(ii) **Logic Model:** Does the applicant, through a Logic Model, clarify in a graphic display the outputs and outcomes developed through the project in accordance with the instructions and information in Appendix C.

pts 0-6

(iii) **Partnership Letters of Commitment:** Do the letters of commitment from partners demonstrate how the applicant will engage with their partner(s) to **effectively develop and implement the project as a model that could be replicated**, and could advance and strengthen the field of EE.

No points should be awarded if no letters of commitment are included, or if letters only indicate endorsement or recommendation of the project. The number of points awarded should reflect the extent of the partnership(s) as described in the letters, and the ability of said partnership(s) to fulfill the project goals.

Subtotal (0 to 18 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

(6) **Programmatic Capability and Past Performance:** Under this factor, proposals will be evaluated based on how well and to what extent (see Sections IV(C)(5)(c) and V(A)(5)):

- pts 0-2 (i) Does the applicant provide evidence of past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in the response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- pts 0-2 (ii) Does the applicant demonstrate a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV(C)(5)(c) of the announcement, including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements, the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements, and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. *(If the applicant indicated that they have not received federal grants in the past, a neutral score of 1 point should be given. If no information is provided, a score of zero should be given.)*
- pts 0-5 (iii) Does the applicant provide evidence of organizational experience and a plan for the timely and successful achievement of the objectives of the project.
- pts 0-6 (iv) Does the applicant provide evidence of staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources (and/or the ability to obtain them) to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

NOTE: EPA may consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant.

Subtotal (0 to 15 points)

Comments (Required):

REDACTED

Worksheet:

<u>Possible points</u>	<u>Score</u>
0-3	(1) Project Summary
0-40	(2) Project Description
0-10	(3) Project Evaluation
0-14	(4) Budget
0-18	(5) Timeline, Logic Model, and Partnership Letters of Commitment
0-15	(6) Programmatic Capability and Past Performance

TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)

Exemption is ☒ Predecisional/Deliberative
☐ Attorney work product
☐ Attorney-client privilege

REDACTED

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
2012 EE REGIONAL MODEL GRANTS PROGRAM

EVALUATION

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name of Organization: Seminole County Public Schools

Applicant ID: EE0413020

Reviewer:

REDACTED

Exemption 6 Personal Privacy

Overall strengths of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Overall weaknesses of the proposal (Required):

REDACTED

Exemption 5



Production of deliberative

Attorney work product

Attorney-client privilege